DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 728 UD 025 102

TITLE	A Study of Student Dropout in the Los Angeles Unified School District.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif.
PUB DATE	4 Feb 85
NOTE	50p.; For related documents, see UD 025 101-103.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Dropout Characteristics; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; *Dropouts; *High Schools; School Holding Power; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This report presents results of an extensive study undertaken to determine the factors contributing to the high dropout rate in the Los Angeles Unified School District, to review options offered to students, and to make recommendations for addressing the dropout problem. First, a list of the 27 people who formed the study committee is provided. A brief background section then outlines the extent of the dropout problem in Los Angeles and in California: an attrition rate of 23 to 42 percent is estimated for the city's high schools. Next, methods employed by the current study, which drew from attrition data collected during the six-year period 1979-1984 from 50 senior high schools and from students, staff, parents and administrators, are outlined. The body of the report is divided into seven sections covering the following information: (1) definitions of the terms "dropout" and "early school leavers"; (2) reasons for dropping out; (3) characteristics of potential dropouts, as described in the literature; (4) descriptions of approximately a dozen current efforts in the Los Angeles school district directed toward the dropout problem; (5) specific findings of the dropout study (highlighting such issues as ethnic, gender and geographic differences in dropout rates); (6) recommendations regarding data collection needs as well as programatic changes that would help remedy the dropout problem in the district; and (7) budgets for implementing the recommended programs. Finally, tables ranking the districts' schoools by attrition rate are attached to the report, as is a bibliography. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED274728

A STUDY OF
STUDENT DROPOUT
IN THE
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

* *

A SUMMARY

PRESENTED TO

DR. HARRY HANDLER, SUPERINTENDENT

AND

BOARD OF EDUCATION

FEBRUARY 4, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pete Martinez
Los Angeles U.S.D.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD025102

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

DROPOUT PREVENTION/RECOVERY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

BETTY BLAKE	LAUSD Sunshine Committee
HENRY E. BOAS	Information Services Division
DAVID F. BOWER	Student Guidance Services
BENITA S. CHAUM	Special Education/Title IX Compliance
MARY CLEGHORN	Los Angeles Indian Center
JACK COOGAN	Office of Assessment and Reconfiguration
DIANA COTTER	United Teachers, Los Angeles
PAT DULDULAO	Asian/Pacific American Education Commission
VERNON J. FULCHER	Student Adjustment Services
LEO GARCIA	DBBAC Unit, LAUSD
PAUL E. GODFREY	Senior High Schools Division
CAROL GORTON	Assistant Principal, Gage Junior High School
DANIEL M. ISAACS	Office of Assessment and Reconfiguration
JUDY C. JUDGE	LAUSD School Psychologists
OBELIA M. LAMOTHE	Administrative Deans Organization
MARTHA LOPEZ	District Bilingual/Bicultural Advisory Committee
ROBERT L. MARTIN	Office of Assessment and Reconfiguration
PEDRO MARTINEZ	Senior High Schools Division
IRVINE W. McCONAGHY	Junior High Schools Principals Organization
WESLEY MITCHELL	LAUSD School Police
DAVID MYKLEBUST	Information Services Division
JUNE V. POUESI	Office of Samoan Affairs
MICHAEL A. ROSALES	Elementary Principals Organization
RICHARD A. RAGUS	Office of the Superintendent
PHYLLIS R. SMITH	Senior High Schools Division
FLORALINE I. STEVENS	Research and Evaluation
VIRGINIA H. T. WHITE	Special Education Commission

AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

During the past decade the number of students leaving high school prior to graduation has steadily increased. Richard Maurer, in his article, "Dropout Prevention: An Intervention Model for Today's High Schools," stated that the number of students leaving U.S. high schools prior to graduation is an alarming 26%, and 50% if the school is located in an urban center (29: 470-471). The Citizens Policy Center has estimated that the attrition rate of ninth through twelfth grade students in California is 23% (33:8). During the 1981-82 school year the leavers rate for tenth through twelfth grade students in the Los Angeles Unified School District was 7.2% (25:12). If this figure included ninth graders and was projected over a four-year period, it would be comparable to the California attrition rate. However, a study of the graduation and attrition rates for the 1982 graduating class of the Los Angeles Unified School District found 42% fewer students graduating than had entered tenth grade three years earlier (26:6).

A review of the literature reveals the serious nature of the problem of students dropping out of school and the consequences for those individuals and society.

One of the most definitive reports on the costs of dropping out to individuals and society was prepared for the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity by Henry M. Levin in 1972 (24). Levin concluded that youths who fail to complete high school are more likely to become economic burdens to society, and that the public will pay heavily for the high proportion of youths who drop out, in increased taxes to support welfare programs, fight crime, and maintain special programs. Youths who leave school early, states Levin, are also less likely to move up the socio-economic ladder or participate in the decision-making processes of government.

Lisa Beck and Joseph A. Muia in their study of dropouts reached the conclusion that:

> Without a diploma or a marketable skill, the dropout faces unemployment or a low paying blue-collar job, together

> with feelings of inferiority and alienation. The costs of quitting school are obviously high for the dropout, but they are also high for society, which must bear the financial brunt of the dropout's inability to hold a job. Considering the tragic circumstances of dropping out, preventative action within the schools is not only desirable but essential. (3:65)

Papagiannis, Bickel and Fuller concluded that "dropouts today face a far different social and economic environment than they did 50 or even 25 years ago. The major problem is the shortage of. . .low-level employment opportunities due to the transformation of urban labor markets" (34:369).

Constance Timberlake found the rate of unemployment for dropouts to be almost double that of employment for graduates. She stated that "we are moving increasingly toward a time in history when the high school diploma is a minimum requirement for entry into the world of work" (41:124).

In examining the extent of the high school dropout problem in 1979, Rumberger reached the following conclusion:

> While various problems have besieged high schools over the years, one problem has remained since their inception--getting students to finish. Many people believe that the incidence of dropping out has diminished over the years to a point where it is no longer a severe problem. Yet recent evidence suggests the contrary. The problem of dropping out, which historically was largely confined to minority and disadvantaged youth appears to be increasing, especially among white, middle-class youth. (36:199-200)

Being aware of this serious problem and its social and economic implications for students and the community, in July 1984, the Board of Education and Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District identified dropout prevention as one of the top priorities for the District. A District

Dropout Prevention/Recovery Task Force was established to study the extent of the problem and make recommendations for its solutions.

The major concerns of this study are as follows:

1. Develop and recommend to the Superintendent and Board of Education a practical definition of "dropout."

2. Investigate the reasons why students leave school prior to graduation from high school.

3. Identify the major characteristics of dropouts.

4. Identify local, state and national efforts that are presently working to retain potential and recover actual school dropouts.

5. Investigate and report the extent of the dropout problem in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

6. Recommend short and long range programs, practices, organizational and instructional changes, and alternative educational programs for reducing the District's dropout rate and attracting actual dropouts back to school.

7. Develop and recommend a budget for implementing recommended dropout prevention/recovery programs.

LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations

According to Olsen, Edwards and Gonzales:

> . . .during the past decade, the school dropout rate has steadily increased. Exactly how many young people drop out is unknown because of definitional problems, lack of data collection systems at the schools, ... (33:7)

Two data collection methods have historically been used by the Los Angeles Unified School District to identify the number and rate of students who drop out of school; 1) having all senior high schools report on Record of Transfer forms students identified as L8's. The L8 code refers to students who are dropped from school rolls for specific reasons and will not be receiving instruction (25:2). The L8 leavers are then referred to as "early school leavers" and defined as dropouts, and 2) collecting attrition rate data for graduating classes by identifying districtwide the total number of students entering and leaving in one class as it progressed from tenth through twelfth grade. These data were supplemented by school counts of late graduates: seniors who did not qualify to graduate in June, but who earned a diploma or passed the California High School Proficiency Examination by the end of August of the graduation year (26:1).

Any method used, however, has certain limitations. Therefore this study must be interpreted in light of the following limitations:

1. The Los Angeles Unified School District dropout rates reported in this study were derived from information reported by 50 senior high schools on their L8 leavers, and attrition data collected during the six-year period 1979-84. The use of other data may result in different rates of dropout.

2. Senior high schools are required to report only L8 leavers who are in grades ten through twelve. Ninth grade students who are dropped from school rolls for reasons identified under the L8 category are not reported on the Record of Transfer form and are therefore not included in the reported dropout rates. Inclusion of ninth grade leavers in the study may result in a different dropout rate.

3. Those students who do not return to school after the summer vacation and whose transfer to another public or private senior high program cannot be verified are not reported as L8's, therefore are not included in this study. Inclusion of these students in the study may result in a different dropout rate.

4. Graduated ninth grade junior high school students who choose not to matriculate to a public or private senior high program which leads to a diploma are not reported as L8's, therefore are not included in this study. Inclusion of these students in the study may result in a different dropout rate.

5. There is no one procedure or method in the District for identifying and reporting intra- and/or inter-district movement of students, by name, from kindergarten (or initial enrollment in a LAUSD school) through twelfth grade graduation (or until leaving the District and verifying enrollment into another school program). An effective method of tracking individual students, by name, may result in dropout data collection which may produce different dropout rate results.

Delimitations

1. This study was limited to tenth through twelfth grade students enrolled in fifty (50) regular senior high schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Tenth through twelfth grade students enrolled in Continuation, 10-12 Special Education, Regional Occupational Center, Community Adult School and 10-12 Magnet School Programs are not included in the study.

2. To determine the opinions of staff, students and parents regarding factors contributing to student dropout, a survey was administered to all school-based administrators and a limited number of teachers, students, parents and community representatives from all junior high, senior high, continuation, 9-12 special education, and junior and senior high magnet schools. Administrators, teachers, students, parents and community representatives from pre-kindergarten through sixth grade schools were not surveyed. Students in grades seven and eight were not surveyed.

Recommended Definition of "Dropout"

It is not known how many of the students who leave high school prior to graduation enter other secondary school programs to complete graduation requirements. Therefore, all early leavers cannot be considered "dropouts." It is important then that a definition of "dropout" be developed for use by the District to facilitate accurate dropout information reporting and data collection.

The District Dropout Prevention/Recovery Committee recommends the adoption of the following definition of "dropout":

> "A dropout is any person who leaves school prior to graduation from high school and who does not enter, within 45 school days, another public or private school or program which leads to a high school diploma or its equivalent."

Thus, dropout may include students who leave school prior to graduation because of marriage, pregnancy, full-time employment or military service.

Other Definitions

Early School Leavers - The term "Early School Leavers" refers to those students who are dropped from the school roll for reasons which categorize them as L8's. L8 is a code used by the District to identify reasons for student movement.

REASONS FOR STUDENT DROPOUT

"School districts must account for students who withdraw. They usually record withdrawals by certain legally defined categories. While these data are informative about the legal explanations for dropping out they do not reveal what caused the students to take this avenue rather than remain enrolled in school" (20:38).

Although the findings of research tend to show general agreement regarding reasons why students decide to leave school prior to receiving a high school diploma, differences of opinions do exist among educators, students and parents about the primary reasons influencing dropout.

A study conducted by the Minnesota Department of Education found that educators identified "educational problems, lack of interest in school, personal and family problems, and adjustment and personality problems" as primary reasons for students leaving school (10).

In a study by the Citizens Policy Center, when dropouts were asked why they quit school they cited "personal issues such as parenthood, economic necessity, involvement with the law, running away or overwhelming personal problems that made school a low priority" (33:22-28). They also identified a wide range of complaints related to their school experiences.

> They cite their own failure to achieve, school practices such as expulsion and suspension that make them feel rejected, the low quality of instruction, the sense that teachers don't care about them or their education, the irrelevance of the curriculum, conformity pressures and a sense of not fitting, an impersonal bureaucracy, irrational rules, and treatment that fails to give young people the chance to be responsible. They often indicate feeling isolated and unfairly treated in school. (33:13-18; 37)

In October 1984 the Los Angeles Unified School District surveyed administrators, teachers, students and parents from junior and senior high, continuation, special education and 9-12 magnet schools to solicit their opinions regarding those factors contributing to students leaving school prior to receiving a high school diploma. Responses were received from 488 administrators (principals, assistant principals, deans, head counselors, program coordinators), 1,166 teachers, 1,637 parents, and 1,701 students. An analysis of those responses indicate the following:

1. Administrators identified poor grades, pregnancy, financial difficulties, problems with teachers, conflict with other students, family problems, age (18 years or older), work responsibilities, dislike of school, habitual truancy and learning rate as the primary factors contributing to students' decisions to leave school.

2. Teachers indicated that students drop out of school primarily due to poor grades, pregnancy, suspension/expulsion, family problems, age (18 years or older), work responsibilities, dislike of school, habitual truancy, slow learning rate; and to a lesser degree financial difficulties and problems with teachers.

3. Parents responded that the major factors contributing to student dropout are poor grades, pregnancy, family problems, dislike of school, habitual truancy; and to a lesser degree problems with teachers, suspension/expulsion, conflict with other students, negative school environment, age (18 years or older), and slow learning rate.

4. Students cited poor grades, pregnancy, family problems, dislike of school, habitual truancy; and to a lesser degree problems with teachers, suspension/expulsion, work responsibilities and conflict with other students as major reasons for students leaving school.

During July and August 1984, Research and Evaluation Branch conducted a follow-up study of school leavers to obtain their opinions regarding the reasons for their leaving school prior to high school graduation. Over 370

dropouts were interviewed. An analysis of the responses of these former students are as follows:

1. Poor grades (39.9%), family reasons (39.1%), age (33.3%) and work responsibilities (29.8%) were given as the primary reasons for dropping out of school.

2. Few of the respondents viewed their schools as hostile to them (11.1%), or felt they had problems with their teachers (24.3%) or other students (20.0%).

3. Almost one-third (31.2%) of the sample indicated they had lost interest in school by the time they reached high school.

4. A majority of the respondents felt positive about most of their school experiences.

5. Forty-one percent (41%) of the respondents indicated that they had enrolled in regular, continuation or technical schools after initially leaving high school.

During the Fall 1984, thirty-four (34) parents/guardians of the early school leavers in the July-August 1984 study were interviewed to get their opinions regarding those factors contributing to student dropout. An analysis of their responses are as follows:

1. The primary reason given by parents and guardians for their children leaving school was the loss of interest in school (47.1%).

2. Some respondents indicated that poor grades (32.4%), teacher problems (29.4%), health (20.6%) other students at school (23.5%), and family (23.5%) were factors contributing to their children's decision to drop out of school.

3. An overwhelming majority of the respondents (85.3%) indicated that school was a friendly place for their children when they were in attendance.

4. A majority of the respondents indicated that their children had the ability (64.7%) and skills (61.8%) to meet the requirements for graduating from high school.

5. An overwhelming majority of the parents/guardians responding (85.3%) indicated that their children who dropped out of school would not recommend to their friends to leave school before graduating.

6. Over sixty-one percent (61.8%) of the respondents stated that their children had been employed since leaving school, and over twenty-three percent (23.5%) indicated that their children had re-enrolled in a regular or continuation school.

Understanding the reasons why young people leave school prior to graduating from high school is extremely significant. If the problem of drop-out is to be effectively addressed, schools and school districts must plan and implement prevention programs that are designed to eliminate or reduce those factors perceived by students and their parents as school attendance impediments.

CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL DROPOUTS

Dropping out of school does not just happen to young people (1:1). By the time the potential dropout enters the ninth grade (and may be as early as fifth grade) he/she may already possess some of the characteristics that are commonly found among students who are potential or actual dropouts. If he/she is two or more years behind in reading or math, has failed at one or more grades, has irregular attendance and frequent tardiness, consistently performs below potential, does not participate in extracurricular activities, changes schools frequently, regularly exhibits unacceptable behavior requiring disciplinary measures, lives in an unhappy family situation, comes from a broken home, has parents who are inconsistent in affection and discipline, has parents who have less than an eighth grade education, has friends who are not school oriented, is resentful of authority, engages in delinquent behavior outside of school, or has a weak self-image, then he/she has a greater than average chance of becoming a dropout (9:198-199).

Beck and Muia in their study of dropouts found the characteristics of dropouts to include "low self-esteem, little desire for self-growth, and limited commitment to accepted social values, and that the majority are from blue-collar or lower white-collar homes; the lower the socioeconomic level of his family, the greater a student's chance of becoming a dropout" (4:16-17).

In a further study of school dropouts, Beck and Muia made a more detailed study of their characteristics "in order to further understand what causes a competent individual to quit school. . . ." (3:66-69). They examined dropout's family, socioeconomic status, social factors, attitudes, academic life and behavior and reached the following conclusions:

1. The primary characteristic of the high school dropout is an unsatisfactory relationship with his/her family. The dropout's family is less solid, less influenced by a father figure, less likely to interact in leisure activities, and less able to communicate than the graduate's family.

2. There is a correlation between low and socioeconomic status and high dropout rate. However, this correlation is not due to the student's inability to afford an education. "The problem is that the lower-class child is neither willing nor able to conform to the school's middle class standards of obedience, docility, and scholarship. . . . Day after day, the child is forced to attend a school which destroys his concept of self worth, instills feelings of insecurity and frustration, and reinforces his ideas that he is unable to learn" (3:67).

3. The potential dropout often forms friendships with others like himself/herself--those who understand his/her problems and share his/her concerns. Unfortunately, many of those persons selected for reinforcement are likely to be dropouts or in the process of dropping out, and contact with those persons maximizes the probability that this dissatisfied adolescent will choose to quit school as a solution for feelings of insecurity.

4. Dropouts display feelings of alienation from their schools, homes, neighborhoods, and/or society in general. These feelings are primarily caused by the perception of having suffered great injustices. Thus, students who have been rejected because of language, race, culture or religion are extremely susceptible to alienation and dropping out.

5. Academic failure is a highly significant predictor of quitting school. Research indicates that a poor student who fails either of the first two grades has only a twenty percent (20%) chance of graduating. Failure at the eighth or ninth grade is also crucial in the student's decision to drop out. Dropouts are held back five times more often than are graduates.

6. The rate of delinquent behavior is far higher among dropouts than among graduates. Unfortunately, many potential dropouts release their frustration and hostilities through delinquent behavior.

In a study of high school dropouts in Muncie, Indiana, Hewitt and Johnson characterized the potential dropout as follows:

> It becomes rather clear that the composite picture that is emerging of the 1977 dropout is one of an individual with poor grades, low involvement in social activities and a personal dissatisfaction with school in general. (17:255)

All school dropouts are not necessarily the kinds of students that our sterotypes of dropouts may lead us to expect. Many are not special education students; they have no handicaps. Nor are they necessarily low I.Q., low-income, or minority students. "The dropout or potential dropout tends to mirror the constituency of the district as a whole" (43:469). Fine and Rosenberg seem to confirm this general assessment of the characteristics of dropouts when they stated:

> . . ., empirical data demonstrate that many adolescents who leave school are academically and intellectually above-average students, keenly aware of the contradictions between their academic learning and lived experiences, critical of the meritocratic ideology promoted in their schools, and cognizant of race/class/gender discrimination both in school and in the labor force. These dropouts are often willing to challenge authorities over a perceived injustice, and at the same time are unwilling to accommodate to the social relationships and definition of knowledge that schools legitimate. These forms of knowledge and social relationships. . .have been termed the "hidden curriculum" of schools. In rejecting this hidden curriculum, dropouts in fact are resisting the dominant ideology of school and work. But their critique of schools has been unrecognized--delegitimated by the prevailing view that dropouts are deviant, lazy or inadequate. (14:259)

A review of the research on dropouts reveals that although early school leavers tend to possess some common identifiable characteristics,

an error will be made if all students possessing some of these characteristics are viewed as potential dropouts, and other students possessing few or none of these characteristics are viewed as non-potential drops. It is important, however, that we know and understand the most common of these dropout characteristics in order to develop early intervention and prevention/recovery programs to permanently reduce the rate at which students are presently dropping out of school.

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Despite the complex set of social, personal, familial, and educational factors and circumstances affecting school participation, it is possible to intervene. (20:40). However, in order for intervention to be successful in reducing or eliminating those factors contributing to students leaving school prior to receiving a high school diploma, programs and practices must be developed to address individual, social, personal, academic and psychological needs of students.

Many schools and school systems throughout the nation (including Los Angeles Unified School District), aware of the personal, social and economic consequences of student dropout, have developed programs to identify and provide dropout prevention assistance to potential dropouts, and educational alternatives for actual dropouts who wish to complete their education in a school environment different than the regular comprehensive high school. Following are summaries of efforts by schools and districts to address the problem of student dropout.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT EFFORTS

Senior High Schools Options

Senior High Schools Options programs serve those students whose potential for academic success can better be achieved in other than the District's regular junior and senior high schools.

Student Adjustment Services (K-12)

Several potential dropout intervention programs are administered by Student Adjustment Services Branch.

1. Pupil Services and Attendance Counselors

Trained and experienced in all aspects of counseling, the PSA counselor works with both individual pupils and groups composed of

pupils having similar types of problems. The PSAC also visits homes and talks with parents and other family members to enlist support in resolving problems.

2. Attendance Support Teams

The Branch is currently expanding a Region/Division program which assists schools in improving their attendance accounting methods and suggests more efficient and accurate procedures. The reviews often lead to increased attendance.

3. Operation Stay-In-School (OSIS)

OSIS is a joint effort of the LAUSD and various law enforcement agencies including LAPD and LA County Sheriff's Department. This successful program relies upon a combination of police department interception and School District counseling of out-of-school youngsters.

4. Special Needs Assignment Committee (SNAC)

SNAC is an outgrowth of concern for pupils who get "lost" in the system. SNAC membership includes high level administrators from Instruction, Guidance and Counseling, Psychological Services, Special Education, and Continuation Education and is headed by Student Adjustment Services personnel. Pupils are referred to SNAC after all other avenues of remediation have been attempted and previously proposed solutions have not been effective.

5. Juvenile Justice Centers (JJC)

PSA counselors act as School District/Juvenile Court liaison officers at four juvenile courts. These counselors provide important information to judges and referees regarding academic standing and the school attendance of students brought before the court.

6. Computer Telephone-Dialers

A new concept which has been reviewed and tested by Student Adjustment Services is that of computer telephone dialers. Dialers may be programmed to dial up to 2000 pupil telephone numbers, inform the respondent of pupil absence, request information about the absence, and record the answers which will be available for school personnel the following day. They will assist school personnel in determining reasons for absence, and will certainly have an effect on pupil attendance.

7. Integration Support Teams

Presently, ten PSA Counselors are assigned to work with children and parents participating in Capacity Adjustment Programs (CAP), Satellite Zones (SAT), and Permits with Transportation (PWT). Four counselors are assigned to CAP/SAT programs and provide PSA services for all students, K through 12. These counselors are working with PWT schools and deal mainly with crisis situations. Their efforts are concentrated in, but not limited to, the schools with large PWT enrollments. Contacts are frequently made after the normal working day of the parents.

Student Advocate Program (10-12) - Roosevelt High School

The Roosevelt High School Student Advocate Program is designed to identify potential school leavers prior to their entrance to the school; provide them with incentives and highly individualized instruction and counseling; involve their families in the program in ways that help the student attend school regularly, progress academically and personally; and alleviate parent/child and other family problems.

School-Within-A-School Program (10-12) - Garfield High School

The Garfield High School "School-Within-A-School" Program will utilize a team teaching and counseling approach to help targeted students overcome academic, attendance and other difficulties. Highly individualized instruction and coordinated planning, teaching and counseling are the key elements of the Program.

Diploma Plus (Adult School)

Diploma Plus, a new approach to adult academic education, is a program for adults who want to go back to school. Designed by adult educators, students and community members, the program stresses acquiring basic academic and life skills necessary for success in today's world. Students enrolled in the program can earn an adult high school diploma, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, improve their reading, writing and math skills, prepare for job training or college, and develop life skills for personal and job success.

Tenth Grade Counseling and Guidance Program

The intent of the Tenth Grade Counseling and Guidance Program, provided under the provisions of the Hughes-Hart Educational Reform Act of 1983 (SB 813), is to provide each tenth grade student with a complete academic progress review, counseling regarding educational options available during the final two years of high school, and information regarding post-secondary educational and career opportunities.

Cities In Schools (CIS)

Cities in Schools (CIS) is a national, private non-profit organization which coordinates existing human and social services on school sites for students. It tests, evaluates and assesses the various needs of students and meets these needs through a variety of social and program enhancement services, which include counseling, life planning workshops, and pre-employment training.

Summary

These are but a few efforts in the Los Angeles Unified School District directed toward addressing the problem of student dropout. Other public and private agency programs are operating within individual schools. An effort should be made to develop an annotated list of all efforts in the District directed toward reducing the rate of student dropout and annually evaluate the success of these efforts.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF STUDENT DROPOUT FOR THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

PURPOSE

The major purpose of this study may be stated as follows: What is the rate at which Los Angeles Unified School District students are dropping out of school prior to receiving a high school diploma? What efforts should be implemented by the District to reduce or eliminate student dropout? As the study was conducted, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Does the Los Angeles Unified School District have a formal process for identifying and reporting, on a regular basis, a category of students designated "Dropout"?

2. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the District for students from different racial/ethnic groups?

3. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the District for male and female students?

4. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the District for students at different grade levels?

5. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the District for schools based on their geographical locations?

6. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the same school for students from various racial/ethnic groups?

7. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the same school for male and female students?

8. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the same school for students at different grade levels?

9. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the same school for "resident" and "non-resident" students?

10. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates within the same school for students whose racial/ethnic group comprise the student body majority and students whose racial/ethnic group comprise the student body minority?

11. Are there significant differences in the dropout rates for schools located in the same geographical area (Administrative Region)?

12. Are there significant differences in the dropout rate within the District based on reported reasons?

13. Are there significant differences in the dropout rate within the same school based on reported reasons?

14. Are there significant differences within the District in reported reasons for dropping out for students from different racial/ethnic groups?

15. Are there significant differences within the District in reported reasons for dropping out for female and male students?

16. Are there significant differences within the same school in reported reasons for dropping out for students from different racial/ethnic groups?

17. Are there significant differences within the same school in reported reasons for dropping out for female and male students?

18. Are there significant differences in reported reasons for dropping out for students from schools located in the same geographical area (Administrative Region)?

METHODS USED TO DETERMINE RATE OF STUDENT DROPOUT

As described in the Limitations Section of this report, two data collection methods are presently used by the Los Angeles Unified School District to determine the number and rate of students leaving school prior to meeting the requirements for high school graduation; Report of Early School Leavers and Report of Attrition Rates. The results, as determined by each method, are presented in this report.

Report of Early School Leavers

Senior high schools (regular, continuation, magnet, opportunity, special education) submit a monthly report to the Research and Evaluation Branch on the number of students who are dropped from the school rolls. These names of the students, identified by the code "L8" (Unknown and Drop), are reported on the "Record of Transfer" forms stating the specific reasons why the students have been dropped. The reasons listed on the "Record of Transfer" Form (some of which may be used for identifying a student as "L8", thus dropping him/her from the school roll) are as follows: 1) Family Moving, 2) Full-time Employment, 3) Institutionalized Pupil, 4) Marriage, 5) Medical Exclusion, 6) Military Service, 7) Non-Public School, 8) Opportunity Transfer, 9) Opportunity Transfer Cancelled, 10) Overage, 11) Permit Cancelled, 12) Statement of Residence, 13) Whereabouts Unknown, 14) Regular, 15) Curriculum, 16) Sibling, 17) Medical, 18) Failed Competency Test, 19) PWT, and 20) Other. This report includes students in grades ten (10), eleven (11) and twelve (12). Ninth grade students in 7-9 junior high and 9-12 senior high schools are not reported on this form.

Early School Leavers data used in this study were collected for fifty (50) senior high schools for the three-year period 1981-84.

Report of Attrition Rate

Senior high schools (also elementary and junior high (intermediate) are required to report monthly student enrollment, by grade level, to Pupil Statistics and Report Section, Budget Division. The number of students

reported enrolled in tenth grade districtwide in a given year is compared to the number of students graduating districtwide with that same class three years later. The difference is the number of students entering and leaving all senior high schools in one class as it progressed from tenth through twelfth grade is reported as the attrition rate.

Attrition rate data used in this study were collected for fifty (50) senior high schools for the six year period (three classes) 1979-84.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Data for use in this study to determine the number of students in the Los Angeles Unified School District leaving school prior to high school graduation were collected from two sources; Report of Early School Leavers and Report of Attrition Rate. Data collected from each source were analyzed and will be reported as independent entities in the discussion of the findings.

Based on an analysis of the data regarding student dropout in the Los Angeles Unified School District, the following findings are reported:

1. Los Angeles Unified School District does not have a process for collecting and reporting, nor requires schools to collect and report, a category of students designated "Dropout." Therefore, data for that designated category of student are unavailable for collection and analysis.

The term "dropout" as used in this report references Early School Leavers and/or Attrition, and may or may not accurately reflect the actual student dropout rate.

2. The rate of student dropout for fifty (50) senior high schools during the three-year period of 1981-84, based on data collected from the Report of Early School Leavers, is 6.41%.

The rate of student dropout for three classes of students for forty-nine (49) senior high schools during the six-year period of

1979-84, based on data collected from the Report of Attrition Rate is 42.3%.

The difference in the rate of student dropout obtained from the two methods is probably due to non-collection and--reporting as leavers, by the Report of Early School Leavers, of those students who do not return to school after summer vacation, and year-round students not returning to school after off-track vacation when they are moving to a new grade level.

3. There are significant differences in the districtwide dropout rates for students from different racial/ethnic groups.

An analysis of data from the Report of Early School Leavers shows the districtwide dropout rate for American Indians is 1.97%; Asians/Pacific Islanders, 3.61%; Blacks, 6.53%; Hispanics, 8.31%; and Whites, 4.88%.

An analysis of the leavers shows that American Indians represent .10% of all leavers; Asians, 5.03%; Blacks, 24.61%; Hispanics, 47.37%, and Whites, 22.89%.

4. Significant differences do exist in districtwide dropout rates for male and female students.

Data from the Report of Early School Leavers show male students representing 59.55% of all school leavers and female students 39.03%.

5. There are significant differences in districtwide dropout rates for students at different grade levels; for grades 10-11, and 12.

Over forty-four percent (44.10%) of the leavers during the period 1981-84 were tenth grade students; 31.47% were in eleventh grade; 24.43% were twelfth grades. This means that over seventy-five percent (75.57%) of the leavers left school during their tenth and eleventh grade years.

6. Schools with predominately Hispanic and Black student populations have higher dropout rates than schools with predominately Asian and White student populations, as measured by both Early School Leavers and Attrition Rates reports.

Since the dominant racial/ethnic student group of a school's population generally tends to reflect the racial/ethnic population of the neighborhood in which the school is located, it may be mistakenly concluded that differences do exist in the dropout rates for schools based on their geographical location. However, dropout rates of schools do not reflect geographic location per se but other factors operating within the schools and communities.

7. An analysis of the data from the Report School Leavers suggests that intra-school dropout rate differences do exist for students of different racial/ethnic groups. Generally, the dropout rate within a school is higher for those students whose racial/ethnic group represents a significantly small percentage of the student population. This difference generally exists regardless of the race/ethnicity of the student population minority.

8. In forty-eight (48) of the schools the dropout rates of male students are greater than the dropout rates of female students. In one school (Garfield), the dropout rate for male students (46.15%) is less than the dropout rate for female students (53.85%). In one school (Huntington Park), the dropout rates for female (48.81%) and male (49.83) are almost equivalent.

Generally, the findings show that significant differences do exist in the dropout rates for female and male students within the same school.

9. Intra-school dropout rate differences do exist for students at different grade levels, however, those differences are not uniformed in the fifty (50) schools.

Although many of the fifty (50) schools show a higher rate of dropout for students in grade ten, others have higher rates in grade twelve and eleven.

10. The dropout rates of students are not reported by "resident" and "non-resident" on the Report of Early Leavers and/or Attrition Rate Report. Therefore, a determination cannot be made regarding intra-school dropout rate differences for these two categories of students.

11. There are no significant differences in the dropout rates of schools located within the same geographical area (Administrative Region). Although exceptions exists, generally schools located within the same geographical area have similar dropout rates.

12. The reasons listed most frequently for student dropout, as reported on the Report of Early School Leavers, are "Whereabouts Unknown" (42.52%) and "Overage" (40.58%). Over eighty-three percent (83.10%) of the reported leavers are listed in these two categories. Other reasons given for early leavers are "Full Time Employment (4.61%), "Institutionalized Pupil" (4.21%), "Family Moving" (.75%), "Marriage" (.99%), "Medical Exclusion" (.89%), "Military Service" (.63%), "Medical" (.17%), and "Other" (4.64%).

13. Differences in the intra-school reasons for student dropout are the same as they are districtwide. The reasons reported most often for student dropout, by individual schools, are "Whereabouts Unknown" and "Overage."

14. Reasons for dropping out are not reported by race/ethnicity, therefore a determination cannot be made regarding reasons for dropping out based on racial/ethnic characteristics of students.

15. Male students are reported for leaving due to "Overage" (52.64%) more frequently than female students (43.20%).

Female students are reported more frequently for leaving due to "Whereabouts Unknown" (56.80%) than male students (47.36%).

Female students are reported more frequently for leaving due to "Marriage" (90.28%) than male students (7.18%).

Male students are reported for leaving due to "Full Time Employment", "Institutionalized Pupil", "Family Moving", "Medical Exclusion", and "Military Service" more frequently than female students.

16. Reported dropout reasons frequency for female and male students within the same school are similar to those reported for female and male students districtwide.

17. Generally, there are no significant differences in reported reasons for students dropping out from schools located within the same geographical area (Administrative Region).

18. Generally, there are inter-school differences in reported reasons for students dropping out. Although reasons given most frequently (Whereabout Unknown and Overage) are the same for all schools, those schools where a majority or large percentage of the student populations are "Black" and/or "Hispanic" report more students leaving for "Full Time Employment" and "Institutionalized Pupil" than schools whose student populations are mostly "White" and/or "Asian/Pacific Islanders."

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings and conclusions of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. The Los Angeles Unified School District should adopt the definition of "dropout" as recommended by the District Dropout Prevention/

Recovery Committee in order to facilitate a more accurate collection and reporting of dropout data and information; i.e., "A dropout is any person who leaves school prior to graduation from high school and who does not enter, within 45 calendar days, another public or private school or program which leads to a high school diploma or its equivalent."

2. The Los Angeles Unified School District should develop and implement a process for collecting and reporting data on a specific category of student designated "Dropout." Students required to be reported in this category should be defined as any student who enrolled in a school in Los Angeles Unified School District at any time (K-12) and for any period of time (one day or more), and before graduating from high school left the school for a period of 45 calendar days or more without entering another public or private school. The components of this process should be:

a. A Student Data System for identifying each student by name and student identification number. The name of every student who has enrolled in a Los Angeles Unified School District school and is of compulsory school attendance age (including students who have left and not been verified as having entered another school) should be included, with an assigned ID number.

   The names of students over 18 years of age who within the last three years left school without receiving a high school diploma should also be included.

b. All schools (K-12) should be required to report on their Statistical Report each month, using the designated code "Do," (initial report for traditional calendar schools due forty-five days after beginning of school) the names of all students who meet the definition of "dropout," including students who do not return to school after summer or off-track vacation. This will include those graduating sixth and ninth grade students who do not report to their feeder junior and/or senior high schools. The report should include a section for reporting action taken to locate the students.

c. The names of the "dropouts" should be continued to be reported until such time that they are verified as having enrolled in another school or for the duration of one year.

d. The names of all identified dropouts should be given to the assigned school and Student Adjustment Services Branch where a coordinated effort should be required to return these students to school.

e. Schools should be prohibited from designating students "Inactive" (except the first school month for staffing) or "Unknown" until they have been designated and reported "Dropout" for one year.

3. The reason "Over Age" should be removed from District documents as a reason for students "dropping out" or "early leaving." Students, and schools serving 10-12 or 9-12 students should be advised that there is no maximum age for voluntary high school attendance.

4. An organizational plan should be developed for coordinating the senior high school and Adult/ROC/ROP programs. The needs of some potential dropouts may best be met by allowing concurrent enrollment at both levels; i.e., academic classes at the senior high level and vocational classes at the Adult/ROC level. This will also permit some students to be employed while obtaining the required academic units by attending academic classes concurrently at both levels.

5. Consideration should be given to extending the operating day and week of some senior high schools to provide for students who are employed or have personal responsibilities preventing them from attending all classes during the present normal school day.

a. A ten-hour (8:00 a.m.--6:00 p.m.) operational day, with each teacher continuing to teach a five-period day and students continuing to receive five/six periods of instruction.

b. A six-day week, with a limited number of academic classes offered on Saturday. Teachers will continue to teach only five days each week and five periods each day.

Both of the above options may require additional teaching and administrative staffing.

6. Utilize a variety of methods to familiarize staff, students, and parents of existing educational alternatives within the District, with particular emphasis on information at the junior high school level and as part of the Educational and Career Planning course in Grade 10.

7. Develop a continuum of in-school and off-site educational options, K-12, with flexibility as appropriate as possible.

8. Identify students with potential learning and adjustment problems as early as possible; involve parents, plan intervention strategies, provide appropriate staff support, and monitor progress closely.

9. Expand use of the Kindergarten Intervention Program, particularly in areas of the District with highest dropout rates.

10. Extend opportunities for tutoring into elementary schools to provide for earlier intervention, remediation and support.

11. Encourage greater participation in summer school, including elementary remediation and guidance programs.

12. Provide greater training to all teachers in assessment/diagnosis/prescription in order to help teachers to better individualize instruction.

13. Give greater attention to effective learning, particularly at the elementary school level. Infuse opportunities for self/social awareness into the curriculum. Use Channel 58 in the training of staff and/or presentation of lessons in the affective domain.

14. Consider provision for greater flexibility in meeting graduation requirements through more variable scheduling, self-paced learning approaches, differentiated credit, etc.

15. Increase quantity and quality of support services (counseling, psychological, health, PSA, etc.) available to classroom teachers in assisting students with academic/social problems. Elementary school counselors are particularly needed.

16. Make Opportunity Rooms or some similar small group instructional/remedial/guidance setting available at all levels.

17. Encourage greater involvement in existing educational options such as Continuation, alternative schools, ROC/ROP, Furlough Program, tutoring, etc.

18. Extend Continuation Education classes and/or instructional approaches, such as the 75-Point Multifaceted Contract, into earlier grades. Increase capacity of existing Continuation high schools to accommodate waiting lists and other students who might benefit from this special experience.

19. Expand use of the Furlough Program and independent study as a means of maintaining some tie-in and contact with students who may want to leave the regular school setting for a time without necessarily losing the chance for credits for relevant experiences (keep door open!).

20. Use the Resource Specialist Teacher model and/or other Special Education techniques and programs which can be adopted for effective remedial approaches for potential dropouts who do not qualify as "Individuals with Exceptional Needs."

21. Develop options for teaching basic literacy/competency skills and vocational skills in an integrated approach, thus meeting certain graduation requirements, while at the same time providing preparation for employment.

22. Expand the guidance functions of the junior and senior high school homerooms.

23. Develop and implement special elementary to junior high/intermediate and junior high/intermediate to senior high "transition" programs for special education students.

24. District Dropout Prevention/Recovery Committee should continue to meet on a regular basis for further study and development of the following:

a. An expansion of the senior high program for September 1985.

b. A dropout prevention/recovery program for junior high/intermediate schools (7-9 and/or 6-8) for implementation in September 1985.

c. An early intervention program for elementary schools (K-6 or K-5) for implementation in September 1985.

25. An annotated list of successful local, state and national dropout prevention/recovery practices and programs should be compiled and distributed to all schools and offices in the District. Schools should be urged to use ideas from this list to develop and implement local strategies that will encourage students to remain in school.

26. The District should compile a list of city, county, state and national governmental and private agencies and businesses offering programs and services that are considered helpful in addressing home, school and community problems that are identified as contributors to student dropout.

27. The District should continue to work with the LAUSD/Cities in Schools/ARCO effort to develop a city/county-wide coordinated strategy to reduce the dropout rate. Dr. Harry Handler, Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District and Mr. William M. Marcussen, Assistant to the President, Atlantic Richfield Company, are presently heading this effort.

DROPOUT PREVENTION/RECOVERY PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

If dropout prevention/recovery programs are to be effective they must be implemented at the local school level and designed to serve all students. Even though there are some common characteristics of potential dropouts, research suggests that many students who do not possess these identified characteristics also drop out. Therefore, all students must be considered potential dropouts and any recommended prevention/recovery program must contain various components designed to meet the needs of all students at the targeted school. The primary focus, however, must be on identifying those students who exhibit those characteristics of potential dropouts and providing effective guidance counseling services that will prevent them from dropping out of school while avoiding inducing low self-esteem through stigmatization.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that eight to twelve senior high schools with the highest leavers/attrition rates during the period 1981-84 be selected to participate in the initial Dropout Prevention/Recovery Pilot Program, and provided resources to implement the program.

Each school's program will contain two components: 1) a Prevention Component, and 2) a Recovery Component. The Prevention Component is designed to provide dropout prevention information to all students attending the school and special counseling/guidance and educational resources to any student who is identified as exhibiting attitudes and behaviors that may lead to a potential early school leaving decision. The Recovery Component is designed to implement and support a coordinated student-school-home-community effort to encourage students to complete the requirements for high school graduation.

Two program implementation plans (eight schools; twelve schools) are as follows:

Plan I--Eight Senior High Schools

The eight senior high schools in Plan I will be organized into two

teams--four schools per team. Each team of four schools will be assigned a School Psychologist. Each school will be assigned a Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) Counselor, Dropout Prevention Advisor, and clerical assistance (clerk typist or secretary). The program under Plan I will be supervised by a Program Coordinator who will be under the supervision of the Assistant Superintendent, Senior High Schools Division.

Plan II - Twelve Senior High Schools

The twelve senior high schools in Plan II will be organized into three teams--four schools per team. Each team of four schools will be assigned a School Psychologist. A Pupil Services and Attendance (PSA) Counselor will be assigned to serve two schools (two PSA Counselors per team of four schools). Each school will be assigned a Dropout Prevention Adviser and clerical assistance (Clerk Typist or Secretary). The program under Plan II will be supervised by a Program Coordinator, who will be under the supervision of the Assistant Superintendent, Senior High Schools Division.

Participating Schools

Based on their three-year early school leavers and six-year attrition rates, the following senior high schools are recommended for participating in the District Dropout Prevention/Recovery Pilot Program for the Spring Semester 1985.

1. Plan I - Eight School Program

a. Francis Polytechnic
b. Hollywood
c. Jefferson
d. Jordan
e. Los Angeles
f. Manual Arts
g. Roosevelt
h. San Fernando

2. Plan II - Twelve School Program

a. Bell
b. Belmont
c. Francis Polytechnic
d. Fremont
e. Hollywood
f. Jefferson
g. Jordan
h. Los Angeles
i. Manual
j. Roosevelt
k. San Fernando
l. Washington

BUDGET

PLAN I - EIGHT SCHOOLS
(February 4 - June 30, 1985)

Position	# of Pos.	Rate	Salary	Fringe	Total
Coordinator	1	45G	$ 22,885	$ 4,031	$ 26,916
Psychologist	2	33D	34,167	6,847	41,014
PSA Counselor	8	33D	136,668	27,389	164,057
Non-Classroom+(Differential)	8	B	124,446	26,109	150,555
TOTAL CERTIFICATED	19		$318,166	$64,376	$382,542
Clerk Typist	1	Step 3	$ 5,471	$ 2,898	$ 8,369
or					
Secretary	1	Step 3	7,450	3,354	10,804
TOTAL CLASSIFIED	1				
TOTAL STAFF	20		$323,637 or $325,616	$67,274 or $67,730	$390,911 or $393,346
Cost of Additional Six-Week Summer					
Non-Classroom+(Differential)	8		$ 35,556	$ 3,723	$ 39,279

BUDGET

PLAN I - EIGHT SCHOOLS
(Full Year)

Position	# of Pos.	Basis	Rate	Amount	Salary	Fringe	Total
Coordinator	1	E	45G-4	$4,359	$ 51,000	$ 8,609	$ 59,609
Psychologist	2	B	33D-4	3,254	71,914	14,068	85,982
PSA Counselor	8	B	33D-4	3,254	287,654	56,270	343,924
Non-Classroom +(Differential)	8	B + Z	F-9	2,854 + 109	308,152	58,416	366,568
TOTAL CERTIFICATED	19				$718,720	$137,363	$856,083
Clerk Typist	1	E	Step 3	$1,042	$ 12,191	$ 6,083	$ 18,274
or							
Secretary	1	E	Step 3	1,419	16,602	7,101	23,703
TOTAL CLASSIFIED	1						
TOTAL STAFF	20				$730,911 or $735,322	$143,446 or $144,464	$874,357 or $879,786

BUDGET

PLAN II - TWELVE SCHOOLS
(February 4 - June 30, 1985)

Position	# of Pos.	Rate	Salary	Fringe	Total
Coordinator	1	45G	$ 22,885	$ 4,031	$ 26,916
Psychologist	3	33D	51,251	10,271	61,522
PSA Counselor	6	33D	102,501	20,542	123,043
Non-Classroom+(Differential)	12	B	186,669	39,164	225,833
TOTAL CERTIFICATED	22		$363,306	$74,008	$437,314
Clerk Typist	1	Step 3	$ 5,471	$ 2,898	$ 8,369
or					
Secretary	1	Step 3	7,450	3,354	10,804
TOTAL CLASSIFIED	1				
TOTAL STAFF	23		$368,777 or $370,756	$76,906 or $77,362	$445,683 or $448,118

Cost of Additional Six-Week Summer

Non-Classroom+(Differential)	12		$ 53,334	$ 9,307	$ 98,197

BUDGET

PLAN II - TWELVE SCHOOLS
(Full Year)

Position	# of Pos.	Basis	Rate	Amount	Salary	Fringe	Total
Coordinator	1	E	45G-4	$4,359	$ 51,000	$ 8,609	$ 59,609
Psychologist	3	B	33D-4	3,254	107,870	21,101	128,971
PSA Counselor	6	B	33D-4	3,254	215,740	42,202	257,942
				2,854			
Non-Classroom +(Differential)	12	B + Z	F-9	+ 109	462,228	80,920	543,148
TOTAL CERTIFICATED	22				$836,838	$152,832	$ 989,670
Clerk Typist	1	E	Step 3	$1,042	$ 12,191	$ 6,083	$ 18,274
or							
Secretary	1	E	Step 3	1,419	16,602	7,101	23,703
TOTAL CLASSIFIED	1						
TOTAL STAFF	23				$849,029 or $853,440	$158,915 or $159,933	$1,007,944 or $1,013,373

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

REPORT OF EARLY SCHOOL LEAVERS

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS THREE-YEAR RANKINGS

SCHOOL	3-Yr. Avg. Leavers Rate	3-Yr. Rank
Jefferson	17.7	1
Los Angeles	15.3	2
Francis Polytechnic	14.2	3
Roosevelt	12.5	4
Hollywood	12.4	5
San Fernando	12.2	6
Washington	10.8	7
North Hollywood	10.5	8
Belmont	9.7	9
Locke	9.6	10
Manual Arts	8.8	11
Marshall	8.6	12
Verdugo Hills	8.3	13
Hamilton	8.1	14
Crenshaw	7.6	15
Carson	6.7	16
Dorsey	6.4	17
Reseda	6.2	18
Franklin	6.10	19
Narbonne	6.07	20
Grant	6.0	21
Fremont	5.5	22
Wilson	5.4	23
Fairfax	5.1	24
Westchester	4.93	25
Venice	4.90	26
Jordan	4.8	27
Bell	4.8	27
Monroe	4.63	29
Van Nuys	4.63	29
Cleveland	4.4	31
Sylmar	4.3	32
Banning	4.1	33
Eagle Rock	4.0	34
Garfield	3.90	35
Huntington Park	3.90	35
Birmingham	3.67	37
Chatsworth	3.67	37
Canoga Park	3.30	39
Lincoln	3.30	39
Gardena	3.23	41

SCHOOL	3-Yr. Avg. Leavers Rate	3-Yr. Rank
Granada Hills	3.17	42
San Pedro	3.07	43
South Gate	2.9	44
Taft	2.8	45
El Camino	2.5	46
Kennedy	2.47	47
University	1.8	48
Palisades	1.0	49
Downtown Business Magnet	0.2	50

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

ATTRITION RATE 1979-1984

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS RANKINGS

SCHOOL	Enrollment at 10th Grade (Oct.) (1979-81)	Enrollment at 12th Grade (June) (1981-84)	Attrition Rate	Rank
Belmont	4722	1533	32.5	1
Jefferson	2304	840	63.5	2
Los Angeles	4515	1674	63.0	3
Fremont	2747	1065	61.2	4
San Fernando	3015	1315	56.4	5
Manual Arts	3218	1413	56.1	6
Roosevelt	4813	2135	55.6	7
Bell	3150	1467	53.4	8
Jordan	1364	667	51.1	9
South Gate	2722	1358	50.1	10
Franklin	3179	1593	49.9	11
Locke	2240	1132	49.5	12
Washington	2187	1114	49.1	13
Lincoln	2332	1209	48.2	14
Wilson	2830	1473	48.0	15
Francis Polytechnic	2912	1519	47.8	16
Banning	3704	1977	46.6	17
Cleveland	2614	1416	45.8	18
Sylmar	2214	1207	45.5	19
Narbonne	2806	1567	44.2	20
Dorsey	2529	1423	43.7	21
Reseda	2235	1269	43.2	22
Garfield	3397	1999	41.2	23
Hollywood	2773	1649	40.53	24
Venice	3052	1815	40.53	25
Verdugo Hills	2238	1336	40.30	26
Crenshaw	2669	1594	40.27	27
Van Nuys	2091	1269	39.3	28
Huntington Park	2889	1782	38.3	29
San Pedro	2995	1863	37.8	30
Grant	3748	2348	37.4	31
North Hollywood	2699	1693	37.3	32
Carson	3322	2110	36.5	33
Canoga Park	2285	1464	35.9	34
Monroe	3007	1999	33.5	35

SCHOOL	Enrollment at 10th Grade (Oct.) (1979-81)	Enrollment at 12th Grade (June) (1981-84)	Attrition Rate	Rank
Marshall	3088	2070	33.0	36
Chatsworth	3025	2071	31.5	37
Gardena	3030	2078	31.4	38
Eagle Rock	1465	1008	31.2	39
Hamilton	1714	1184	30.9	40
Taft	2831	1959	30.8	41
Westchester	2000	1410	29.5	42
El Camino	2832	2028	28.4	43
Granada Hills	3062	2205	28.0	44
Kennedy	2880	2157	25.1	45
Birmingham	2347	1766	24.8	46
Fairfax	2180	1694	22.3	47
Palisades	2333	1898	18.6	48
University	2721	2259	17.0	49
Downtown Business	(Attrition Data Not Available)			

BIBIOGRAPHY

1. Bachman, Jerald G.; Green, Swayzer; and Wirtanen, Ilona D., "Dropping Out - Problem or Symptom?" Youth In Transition, Volume II. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1971.

2. Beacham, Herbert C., "Reaching and Helping High School Dropouts and Potential School Leavers." Eric - ED236451, 1980.

3. Beck, Lisa and Muia, Joseph A., "A Portrait of A Tragedy: Research Findings on the Dropout.": The High School Journal, 64 (November 1980), 65-72.

4. Beck, Lisa and Muia, Joseph A., "Potential High School Dropouts." Education Digest, 46 (March 1981), 16-19.

5. Bledsoe, Joseph C., "An Investigation of Six Correlates of Student Withdrawal From High School." Journal of Educational Research, 53 (September 1959), 3-6.

6. Borus, Michael E. and Carpenter, Susan A., "A Note on the Return of Dropouts to High School." Youth and Society, 14 (June 1983), 501-507.

7. Busbee, Cyril B., Curriculum Model for Preventing Dropouts Grades 9-12. South Carolina State Department of Education. Columbia: Office of Vocational Education, 1972.

8. Camp, Catherine; Gibbs, Joel; and Monagan, Marilee, "School Dropouts - A Discussion Paper." California Legislature. Sacramento: Assembly Office of Research, 1980.

9. Cervantes, Lucius F., The Dropout: Causes and Cures. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.

10. CETA - Education Linkage Unit, Division of Special Services. Secondary School Dropouts. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Education, 1981.

11. Curtis, Jonathan, et al., Dropout Prediction. Austin Independent School District. Austin: Texas Office of Research and Evaluation, 1983.

12. Edelman, Marian W.; Allen, Marylee; Brown, Cindy; and Rosewater, Ann, Children Out of School In America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: A Report by the Children's Defense Fund of the Washington Research Project, Inc., 1974.

13. Felice, Lawrence G., "Black Student Dropout Behavior: Disengagement From School Rejection and Racial Discrimination." The Journal of Negro Education, 50 (Fall 1981), 415-424.

14. Fine, Michelle and Rosenberg, Pearl, "Dropping Out of High School: The Ideology of School and Work." Journal of Education, 65 (Summer 1983), 257-272.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

15. Gibboney, Richard A. and Langsdorf, Michael G., "The Career Intern Program: An Experiment in Career Education That Worked." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12 (1979), 103-105.

16. Habley, Wesley R., "Academic Advisement: The Critical Link in Student Retention." National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 18 (Spring 1981), 45-50.

17. Hewitt, John D. and Johnson, William S., "Dropping Out In Middleton." The High School Journal, 62 (March 1979), 252-256.

18. Hispanic Administrators for Quality Education. "Drop-outs in California, The Educational Disaster." A Symposium. Santa Barbara: University of California, 1984.

19. Jacques, Mary Jo, "The Metropolitan Youth Education Center: A Colorado Solution to the Problem of High School Dropout." Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (October 1982), 136-137.

20. Kaeser, Susan C., "Citizen Guide to Children Out of School: The Issues, Data, Explanations and Solutions to Absenteeism, Dropouts and Disciplinary Exclusion." A Report of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools. Cleveland: Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, 1984.

21. Kennedy, John F., "The President's Message on Education to the Congress of the United States." School Life, 45 (January 1963), 22-26.

22. Kennedy, John F., "The President's Recommendations for Education." School Life, 44 (1962), 29-33.

23. Korotkin, Arthur L., "Career Initiation in Association with Alienation from Secondary Schools: Measures for the Evaluation of a Model." Eric Clearinghouse in Career Education: Information Series No. 58-CE 005 087, 1975.

24. Levin, Henry M., The Cost to the Nation of Inadequate Education. Report to the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

25. Los Angeles Unified School District. Early School Leavers: High School Students Who Left School Before Graduating, 1981-82. Publication No. 428. Los Angeles: Research and Evaluation Branch, 1983.

26. Los Angeles Unified School District. Graduation and Attrition Rates in the LAUSD High Schools, Class of 1982. Publication No. 424. Los Angeles: Research and Evaluation Branch, 1982.

27. Los Angeles Unified School District. "A Subcommittee Report on Educational Opportunities and Needs for Divergent Youth." Los Angeles: Office of the Associate Superintendent, 1982.

28. Mahan, Guy and Johnson, Charles, "Portrait of A Dropout: Dealing with Academic, Social and Emotional Problems." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 67 (April 1983), 80-83.

29. Maurer, Richard E., "Dropout Prevention: An Intervention Model for Today's High School." Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (March 1982), 470-471.

30. Merritt, Ray, "The Effects of Enrollment and Social Organization on the Dropout Rate." Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (November 1983), 224.

31. Mertens, Donna, et al., "Vocational Education and The High School Dropout." National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1982.

32. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics. Make Something Happen: Hispanics and Urban High School. Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project, 1984.

33. Olsen, Laurie; Edwards, Rebekah; and Gonzales, Andrew, "Push Out, Step Out: A Report on California's Public School Drop-outs." Open Road Issues Research Project. Oakland: Citizens Policy Center, 1982.

34. Papagiannis, George J.; Bickel, Robert N.; and Fuller, Richard H., "The Social Creation of School Dropouts: Accomplishing the Reproduction of an Underclass." Youth and Society, 14 (March 1983), 363-392.

35. Peng, Samual and Takai, Ricky, "NCES Survey Finds That Dropouts Soon Regret Their Decision." Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (Februrary 1984), 434.

36. Rumberger, Russell W., "Dropping Out of High School: The Influence of Race, Sex and Family Background." American Educational Research Journal, 20 (Summer 1983), 199-220.

37. Rumberger, Russell W., Why Kids Drop Out of High School. Palo Alto: Institute for Research on Education Finance and Goverance, Stanford University, 1981.

38. Sewell, Trevor E.; Palmo, Artis J.; and Manni, John L., "High School Dropout: Psychological, Academic, and Vocational Factors." Urban Education, 16 (April 1981), 65-76.

39. Steinberg, Laurence; Blinde, Patricia Lin; and Chan, Kenyon S., Dropping Out Among Language Minority Youth: A Review of the Literature. Los Alamitos, California: National Center for Bilingual Research, 1982.

40. Stone, Calvin; Lesko, Nancy; Nauman, Craig; and Page, Reba, "Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student." Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, The University of Wisconsin, 1982.

41. Timberlake, Constance, "Attitudinal Differences of Black Female Secondary Students That May Influence Their Graduation From High School." The High School Journal, 66 (December-January 1983), 123-129.

42. Wehlage, Gary G., Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1983.

43. Yaffe, Elaine, "More Sacred Than Motherhood." Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (March 1982), 469-470.

44. Youth Literacy Task Force. Literacy and New York City's High School Aged Youth. New York City: Office of the Mayor, 1982.